



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/672,274	09/24/2003	Christopher C. Toly	SIMU0008	9373

7590 01/16/2009  
LAW OFFICES OF RONALD M. ANDERSON  
Suite 507  
600 - 108th Avenue N.E.  
Bellevue, WA 98004

EXAMINER
----------

HADIZONOZ, BANAFSHEH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3715

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

01/16/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Interview Summary

**Application No.**

10/672,274

**Applicant(s)**

TOLY, CHRISTOPHER C.

**Examiner**

Banafsheh Hadizonooz

**Art Unit**

3715

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Banafsheh Hadizonooz.(3) Sabrina Macintyre.(2) Kathleen Mosser.

(4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 06 January 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 24.

Identification of prior art discussed: Lacey et al. (US 2005/0084833) and Peteline et al. (US 5,436,542).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant discussed the rejection of claim 24. More specifically, she was concerned that the rejection of claim 24 based on the camera structure disclosed in Peteline's invention, would change the fundamental operation of Lacey's invention. The applicant further discussed the possibility of amending the claims to more closely focus on the structure of brackets that hold the camera in place. No agreement was reached regarding the patentability.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Kathleen Mosser/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3715